



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/833,418	04/12/2001	Sarah D. Redpath	RSW920000176US1	1623

7590 09/09/2003  
Gerald R. Woods  
IBM Corporation T81/503  
PO Box 12195  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER
----------

AMINI, JAVID A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2672

546

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/833,418

Applicant(s)

REDPATH ET AL.

Examiner

Javid A Amini

Art Unit

2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 5.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed June 24, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- On page 8 of remarks, lines 24-28, Applicant fails to provide further limitation of the “identifying” element and an “object” in claim 1.
- On page 9 of remarks, lines 10-14, Applicant argues the Paterson teach a method of selecting particular parameter values for a particular object, whereby the selected parameter values are used for a computer simulation. Examiner's reply: Applicant claim language does not specify the use of display data. The Paterson display data are objects and parameter values associated with the objects.
- On page 9 of remarks, lines 15-23, Applicant argues “applying the display attributes... for each object” and “display object with .... displaying attributes”. Examiner's reply: this is very obvious because, the claim languages are very extensive. Paterson's display objects are associated with display attributes.
- On page 9 of remarks, lines 24-26; and page 10, lines 1-6, Applicant argues that the Paterson select parameter and display the selected parameter that correspond to a particular objects, and Applicant's invention select ... and display object. Examiner's reply: The Paterson illustrate in Fig. 10 item 184 select objects and item 194 id display object.
- On page 10 of remarks, lines 7-19, Applicant argues the layers match each of the objects. Examiner's reply: Paterson in (col. 16, lines 35-45) teach the claim languages.

- On page 10 of remarks, lines 20-26, Applicant argument is not clear!
- On page 11 of remarks, lines 1-29, Applicant argues that Paterson and Sawada do not teach the display attributes for each object. Examiner's reply: Paterson does not explicitly specify the display attributes, but Sawada teach the display attributes. As a result in the image displaying system, by modifying or inserting between items 192 and 194 in Fig. 10 of Paterson, item 1402 from Fig. 28, of Sawada, the image display system is capable of displaying data with a display attributes. The result of modification provides the performance of a computer handling not only static images, but also dynamic images.
- The pervious office action's rejection is maintained.

***Pervious office action dated March 24, 2003.***

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paterson et al., and further in view of Sawada et al.

1. Claim 1.

"A method of displaying layered data, said method comprising: selecting one or more objects to be displayed in a plurality of layers; identifying a plurality of display attributes, wherein one or

more of the display attributes corresponds to each of the layers; matching each of the objects to one of the layers; applying the display attributes corresponding to the layer for each of the matched object; and displaying the objects with the applied display attributes”, Paterson et al. illustrates in Fig. 18, in at step 360, and in response to the user identification of parameters at step 358, object and parameter identifiers, and the first values for the selected parameters, are displayed within the layer panel. Paterson illustrates in Fig. 15 is a diagrammatic representation of a baseline foundation, a baseline layer, and three alternative layers which may be substituted for the baseline layer. Paterson illustrates in Fig. 3, each of the layer panels represents an underlying layer object 58. Paterson illustrates in Fig. 12 is a flow chart illustrating a method, according to one embodiment of the invention, of displaying a modifier representation which represents the influence of an object on a relationship condition between a pair of objects.

Paterson teaches in (col. 21, lines 64-67) Fig. 25 shows a diagrammatic representation of a computer system 500 within which software for performing the methodologies discussed above, and for generating a GUI according to the teachings of the present invention, may operate.

Peterson does not specify the display attribute, however Sawada et al. teaches in (col. 2, lines 29-36) of displaying data with a display attribute varying from area to area on the display screen of the image displaying apparatus.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada into Paterson by modifying or inserting between items 192 and 194 in Fig. 10 of Paterson, item 1402 from Fig. 28, of Sawada, the image display system is capable of displaying data with a display attributes. The result of modification provides the performance of a computer handling not only static images, but also dynamic images.

And also in order to control of display brightness, an item of adjustment, includes adjustment of contrast, adjustment of brightness, and control of the amplitudes of a variety of color image signals, such as the red, blue, and green color signals. The adjustment of contrast, the adjustment of brightness, and the control of amplitudes can all be controlled for the entire display screen.

2. Claim 2.

“The method as described in claim 1 further comprising: receiving a request from a user to rearrange the layers; rearranging the layers in response to the request, the rearranging including: re-matching one or more objects to a different layer from the plurality of layers; applying the display attributes corresponding to the different layer to the one or more re matched objects; and displaying the one or more re-matched objects”, Paterson teaches in (col. 13, lines 54-60) In order to accommodate the need to view and access a user-selected group of parameters within a simulation model, the present invention proposes providing a mechanism by which the modeler can create groupings of parameter "aliases" within windows or panels that can be overlaid, or displayed along side, a diagram window and that are distinct from the diagram window. Paterson illustrates in Fig. 12 is a flow chart illustrating a method, according to one embodiment of the invention, of displaying a modifier representation which represents the influence of an object on a relationship condition between a pair of objects.

3. Claim 3.

“The method as described in claim 1 further comprising: reading the objects from a data store; and reading one or more object attributes corresponding to each object from the data store,

Art Unit: 2672

wherein the matching further comprises: matching the object attributes corresponding to each object to one or more layer attributes corresponding to each layer”, Paterson et al. illustrates in Fig. 18, in at step 360, and in response to the user identification of parameters at step 358, object and parameter identifiers, and the first values for the selected parameters, are displayed within the layer panel. Paterson illustrates in Fig. 15 is a diagrammatic representation of a baseline foundation, a baseline layer, and three alternative layers which may be substituted for the baseline layer. Paterson illustrates in Fig. 3, each of the layer panels represents an underlying layer object 58. Paterson illustrates in Fig. 12 is a flow chart illustrating a method, according to one embodiment of the invention, of displaying a modifier representation which represents the influence of an object on a relationship condition between a pair of objects. Paterson teaches in (col. 21, lines 64-67) Fig. 25 shows a diagrammatic representation of a computer system 500 within which software for performing the methodologies discussed above, and for generating a GUI according to the teachings of the present invention, may operate. Peterson does not specify the display attribute, however Sawada et al. teaches in (col. 2, lines 29-36) of displaying data with a display attribute varying from area to area on the display screen of the image displaying apparatus.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada into Paterson in order to control of display brightness, an item of adjustment, includes adjustment of contrast, adjustment of brightness, and control of the amplitudes of a variety of color image signals, such as the red, blue, and green color signals. The adjustment of contrast, the adjustment of brightness, and the control of amplitudes can all be controlled for the entire display screen.

Art Unit: 2672

4. Claim 4.

“The method as described in claim 1 further comprising: creating the objects; setting one or more object attributes corresponding to each object; and storing the object and the object attributes in a data store”, Paterson teaches in (col. 15, lines 7-10) the panel represents an underlying panel object, which is dedicated to receiving and storing input values for user-designated parameters within the simulation model. Paterson teaches in (col. 5, lines 54-57) the settings section includes three values for the relevant parameter, namely a working value, a baseline value and a comparison value.

5. Claim 5.

“The method as described in claim 4 further comprising: establishing one or more relationships from at least one of the objects to one or more other objects”, Paterson teaches in (col. 1, lines 38-45) a simulation model may be constructed using a graphical user interface (GUI) in which the various objects are represented by user-selected icons or other appropriate graphical representations, and in which the inter-relationships between the objects are represented by links.

6. Claim 6.

“The method as described in claim 1 wherein the display attributes are selected from the group consisting of: color hue, color value, color saturation, size, three dimensional image, two dimensional image, animation, shading, fill pattern, line pattern, line weight, opaqueness, transparency, proximity, shape, and object anomaly”, according to Markush groups, Paterson teaches in (col. 19, lines 32-37) a monitor line also provides "animation" of the function



Art Unit: 2672

expressed by the curve plot of a monitor panel as a simulation models advances through time, or as a time parameter is attributed a certain value.

7. Claim 7.

“The method as described in claim 1 further comprising: displaying one or more relationship lines connecting at least one of the objects to one or more other objects”, Paterson illustrates in Fig. 9, is able immediately to ascertain and understand the relationships between the objects represented by the nodes without having to "drill-down" into the representation or to access additional information windows.

8. Claim 8.

“The method as described in claim 1 further comprising: determining a layer order for the plurality of layers, wherein the layer order determines a display emphasis corresponding to objects in the corresponding layers”, Paterson illustrates in Fig. 15 is a diagrammatic representation of a baseline foundation, a baseline layer, and three alternative layers which may be substituted for the baseline layer.

9. Claim 9.

“An information handling system comprising: one or more processors; a memory accessible by the processors; a nonvolatile storage area accessible by the processors; a display screen accessible by the processors; and a layered data display tool to display layered data on the display screen, the layered data display tool including: logic for selecting one or more objects to be displayed in a plurality of layers; identification logic to identify a plurality of display attributes, wherein one or more of the display attributes corresponds to each of the layers; matching logic for matching each of the objects to one of the layers; applicator logic to apply the

Art Unit: 2672

display attributes corresponding to the layer for each of the matched objected; and display control logic to display the objects with the applied display attributes”, Paterson et al. illustrates in Fig. 18, in at step 360, and in response to the user identification of parameters at step 358, object and parameter identifiers, and the first values for the selected parameters, are displayed within the layer panel. Paterson illustrates in Fig. 15 is a diagrammatic representation of a baseline foundation, a baseline layer, and three alternative layers which may be substituted for the baseline layer. Paterson illustrates in Fig. 3, each of the layer panels represents an underlying layer object 58. Paterson illustrates in Fig. 12 is a flow chart illustrating a method, according to one embodiment of the invention, of displaying a modifier representation which represents the influence of an object on a relationship condition between a pair of objects. Paterson teaches in (col. 21, lines 64-67) Fig. 25 shows a diagrammatic representation of a computer system 500 within which software for performing the methodologies discussed above, and for generating a GUI according to the teachings of the present invention, may operate. Peterson does not specify the display attribute, however Sawada et al. teaches in (col. 2, lines 29-36) of displaying data with a display attribute varying from area to area on the display screen of the image displaying apparatus.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada into Paterson in order to control of display brightness, an item of adjustment, includes adjustment of contrast, adjustment of brightness, and control of the amplitudes of a variety of color image signals, such as the red, blue, and green color signals. The adjustment of contrast, the adjustment of brightness, and the control of amplitudes can all be controlled for the entire display screen.

10. Claim 10.

“The information handling system as described in claim9 further comprising: a rearranging request received from a user; rearranging logic to rearrange the displayed layers, the rearranging logic including: re-matching logic to re-match one or more objects to a different layer from the plurality of layers; application logic to apply the display attributes corresponding to the different layer to the one or more re-matched objects; and display logic to display the one or more re-matched objects”, Paterson teaches in (col. 13, lines 54-60) In order to accommodate the need to view and access a user-selected group of parameters within a simulation model, the present invention proposes providing a mechanism by which the modeler can create groupings of parameter "aliases" within windows or panels that can be overlaid, or displayed along side, a diagram window and that are distinct from the diagram window. Paterson illustrates in Fig. 12 is a flow chart illustrating a method, according to one embodiment of the invention, of displaying a modifier representation which represents the influence of an object on a relationship condition between a pair of objects.

11. Claim 11.

“The information handling system as described in claim9 wherein the display attributes are selected from the group consisting of: color hue, color value, color saturation, size, three dimensional image, two dimensional image, animation, shading, fill pattern, line pattern, line weight, opaqueness, transparency, proximity, shape, and object anomaly”, according to Markush groups, Paterson teaches in (col. 19, lines 32-37) a monitor line also provides "animation" of the function expressed by the curve plot of a monitor panel as a simulation models advances through time, or as a time parameter is attributed a certain value.

12. Claim 12.

“The information handling system as described in claim 9 further comprising: logic to read the objects from a data store within then on volatile storage area; and logic to read one or more object attributes corresponding to each object from the data store, wherein the matching logic further comprises: logic to match the object attributes corresponding to each object to one or more layer attributes corresponding to each layer”, Paterson illustrates in Fig. 15 is a diagrammatic representation of a baseline foundation, a baseline layer, and three alternative layers which may be substituted for the baseline layer.

13. Claim 13.

“A computer program product stored on a computer usable medium for displaying layered data, said computer program product comprising: means for selecting one or more objects to be displayed in a plurality of layers; means for identifying a plurality of display attributes, wherein one or more of the display attributes corresponds to each of the layers; means for matching each of the objects to one of the layers; means for applying the display attributes corresponding to the layer for each of the matched objected; and means for displaying the objects with the applied display attributes”, Paterson et al. illustrates in Fig. 18, in at step 360, and in response to the user identification of parameters at step 358, object and parameter identifiers, and the first values for the selected parameters, are displayed within the layer panel. Paterson illustrates in Fig. 15 is a diagrammatic representation of a baseline foundation, a baseline layer, and three alternative layers which may be substituted for the baseline layer. Paterson illustrates in Fig. 3, each of the layer panels represents an underlying layer object 58. Paterson illustrates in Fig. 12 is a flow chart illustrating a method, according to one embodiment of the invention, of displaying a

Art Unit: 2672

modifier representation which represents the influence of an object on a relationship condition between a pair of objects. Paterson teaches in (col. 21, lines 64-67) Fig. 25 shows a diagrammatic representation of a computer system 500 within which software for performing the methodologies discussed above, and for generating a GUI according to the teachings of the present invention, may operate. Peterson does not specify the display attribute, however Sawada et al. teaches in (col. 2, lines 29-36) of displaying data with a display attribute varying from area to area on the display screen of the image displaying apparatus.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada into Paterson in order to control of display brightness, an item of adjustment, includes adjustment of contrast, adjustment of brightness, and control of the amplitudes of a variety of color image signals, such as the red, blue, and green color signals. The adjustment of contrast, the adjustment of brightness, and the control of amplitudes can all be controlled for the entire display screen.

14. Claim 14.

“The computer program product as described in claim 13 further comprising: means for receiving a request from a user to rearrange the layers; means for rearranging the layers in response to the request, the rearranging including: means for re-matching one or more objects to a different layer from the plurality of layers; means for applying the display attributes corresponding to the different layer to the one or more re-matched objects; and means for displaying the one or more re-matched objects”, Paterson teaches in (col. 13, lines 54-60) In order to accommodate the need to view and access a user-selected group of parameters within a simulation model, the present invention proposes providing a mechanism by which the modeler

Art Unit: 2672

can create groupings of parameter "aliases" within windows or panels that can be overlaid, or displayed along side, a diagram window and that are distinct from the diagram window. Paterson illustrates in Fig. 12 is a flow chart illustrating a method, according to one embodiment of the invention, of displaying a modifier representation which represents the influence of an object on a relationship condition between a pair of objects.

15. Claim 15.

"The computer program product as described in claim 13 further comprising: means for reading the objects from a data store; and means for reading one or more object attributes corresponding to each object from the data store, wherein the matching further comprises: means for matching the object attributes corresponding to each object to one or more layer attributes corresponding to each layer", see rejection of claims 13 and 14.

16. Claim 16.

"The computer program product as described in claim 13 further comprising: means for creating the objects; means for setting one or more object attributes corresponding to each object; and means for storing the object and the object attributes in a data store", Paterson teaches in (col. 15, lines 7-10) the panel represents an underlying panel object 56, which is dedicated to receiving and storing input values for user-designated parameters within the simulation model. Paterson teaches in (col. 5, lines 54-57) the settings section includes three values for the relevant parameter, namely a working value, a baseline value and a comparison value.

17. Claim 17.

"The computer program product as described in claim 16 further comprising: means for establishing one or more relationships format least one of the objects to one or more other

Art Unit: 2672

objects”, Paterson teaches in (col. 1, lines 38-45) a simulation model may be constructed using a graphical user interface (GUI) in which the various objects are represented by user-selected icons or other appropriate graphical representations, and in which the inter-relationships between the objects are represented by links.

18. Claim 18.

“The computer program product as described in claim 13 wherein the display attributes are selected from the group consisting of: color hue, color value, color saturation, size, three dimensional image, two dimensional image, animation, shading, fill pattern, line pattern, line weight, opaqueness, transparency, proximity, shape, and object anomaly”, according to Markush groups, Paterson teaches in (col. 19, lines 32-37) a monitor line also provides "animation" of the function expressed by the curve plot of a monitor panel as a simulation models advances through time, or as a time parameter is attributed a certain value.

19. Claim 19.

“The computer program product as described in claim 13 further comprising: means for displaying one or more relationship lines connecting at least one of the objects to one or more other objects”, Paterson illustrates in Fig. 9, is able immediately to ascertain and understand the relationships between the objects represented by the nodes without having to "drill-down" into the representation or to access additional information windows.

20. Claim 20.

“The computer program product as described in claim 13 further comprising: means for determining a layer order for the plurality of layers, wherein the layer order determines a display emphasis corresponding to objects in the corresponding layers”, Paterson illustrates in Fig. 15 is

a diagrammatic representation of a baseline foundation, a baseline layer, and three alternative layers which may be substituted for the baseline layer.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Javid A Amini whose telephone number is 703-605-4248. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi can be reached on 703-305-4713. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-8705 for regular communications and 703-746-8705 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

Javid A Amini  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2672

Javid Amini  
September 2, 2003



**MICHAEL RAZAVI**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**